REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action issued on December 28, 2009. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 9, 15-17 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the December 28, 2009 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claims are method claims that claim purely mental steps. The Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a processor operable to execute computer program instructions;, a memory operable to store the computer program instructions executable by the processor, and computer program instructions stored in the memory and executable to perform the steps. These features are believed to provide the necessary structure to constitute a machine within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 101. traverse this rejection of these claims. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 17 is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chong *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,808).

Claims 1, 5, 15, and 16 have been amended to recite the features creating a secondary B+tree for indexing a primary B+tree, wherein the secondary B+tree comprises a plurality of mapping table row identifiers, where each mapping row identifier is an entry in a row of the secondary B+tree that uniquely identifies a row within a mapping table and a first plurality of database addresses for leaf blocks of the primary B+tree, and creating the mapping table with a corresponding number of database addresses for leaf blocks of the primary B+tree, wherein each of the database addresses is a a guess-database address that is a database address , which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found wherein each of the database addresses is a a guess-database address that is a database address , which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found.

Chong fails to disclose a secondary index as now claimed by claims 1, 5, 15, and 16 where each mapping row identifier is an entry in a row of the secondary B+tree that uniquely identifies a row within a mapping table and a first plurality of database addresses for leaf blocks of the primary B+tree, wherein each of the database addresses is a guess-database address that is a database address, which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found.

Accordingly, Chong fails to disclose each feature recited by claims 1, 5, 16 and 17, and thus fails to anticipate these claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-9, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,660) in view of Nagavamsi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,366).

Neither Liu nor Nagavamsi discloses the features of a mapping table and a secondary index having a guess-database address that is **a database address**, which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found. There is no disclosure in Liu of any such "guess database address." The portion of Liu identified by the Examiner discloses a secondary index record and a primary key value. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the primary key value is a database address, which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found. The Examiner argues that several steps are required to search for the address because Liu does not have the direct address. However, the performance of several steps to find an address is not the invention that is claimed. The invention that is claimed is a a secondary index having a guess-database address that is **a database address**, which corresponds to a guess as to what address block a row of the primary B+tree may be found. Nagavamsi fails to cure the deficiencies of Liu. Accordingly, the combination of the Liu and Nagavamsi fails to teach or suggest the invention of claims 1, 5, 15 and 16.

Each of the claims depending from claims 1, 5, 15 and 16 respectively are also not taught or suggested for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 1, 5, 15 and 16.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-044-US01CON1).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Chadwick A. Jackson, Reg. No. 46,495/

Date: May 28, 2010   Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495

Hanify & King, Professional Corporation
1055 Thomas Jefferson St, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20007
Direct: (202) 403-2102
Fax: (202) 429-4380